

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/580,501	05/23/2006	Petrus Christianus Maas	NL 031427	2333	
24737 PHILIPS INTE	7590 06/18/201 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			DISTEFANO, GREGORY A		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2175	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/18/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/580,501	MAAS, PETRUS CHRISTIANUS		
Examiner	Art Unit		
GREGORY A. DISTEFANO	2175		

	GREGORY A. DISTEFANO	21/5	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FII	LED WITHIN TW
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of a valued or 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMELINATION.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to  a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	auding or simplifying ti	ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / tinonamont (i	TOE OE+).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
IV. [] Outon			
/William L. Bashore/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the Examiner has failed to meet the obligation set forth in MPEP 2144.03 to provide specific factual findings to support official notice.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The examiner believes that sufficient proof HAS been provided to support "a diagonal line has been a well known technique for symbolizing a z-axis or depth value. Multiple prior art references have been made of record in support to show that diagonal lines may be used to represent a depth axis. One such art was that of Allen's Fig. 4A which was noted in the Non-final rejection filed on 10/2/2009. Allend Fig. 4A shows in the top of the figure a set of three axes where there is a first axis (vertical axis) represented as a vertical line, a second axis (horizontal axis) represented as a horizontal line, and a third axis (depth axis) which is represented as a vertical line, a second axis reference is that of Stewart which was presented in the Final Rejection filed 370/3010 PURELY IN SUPPORT the assertion that it was a well known technique that diagonal lines were used to represent a depth axis. The Stewart reference was not intended to become part or of the basis for relection.

The examiner would like to further note that Giligan (US 5.313,229) was made of record in the Non-final rejection filed 10/2/2009 and states in column 12, lines 62-68, that "if the user moves the mouse in one clearly horizontal or vertical direction, the dominant axis status variable is set to either "x" or "y" respectively. If the user "draws" a circle or any other similar figure through the mouse movement where NONE of the equations is satisfied and the alternative "z" axis is assumed". As a diagonal line is not clearly horizontal or vertical, it is clear a "z" axis would be set.